

REMARKS

Entry of Amendment

As Applicant is filing a RCE herewith, this amendment should be entered and considered at this time.

Applicant will now address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102/103

Claims 1-4, 13 and 14

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-4, 13 and 14 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Osamu et al. (JP 06-176870). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending Claims 1-4 and 13 to recite that the claims are directed to an active matrix electroluminescence display device having plural pixels. These features are supported by, for example, Embodiment 1 of the specification (English translation) of the present application. Embodiment 1 starts at page 15, line 18 et seq. and, for example, references Fig. 6. Page 10, lines 26-27 of the specification states that "Fig. 6 is an illustration to show an electroluminescence device of an active matrix structure." Page 16, lines 26 et seq. of Embodiment 1 states that pixel part 602 of Fig. 6 is formed of a plurality of pixels. Hence, there is clear support for these features.

In Osamu, an electroluminescence device is formed so that a positive electrode 12 is directly in contact with an insulating transparent substrate 11. See e.g. paragraphs [0019] - [0023], Example

1; and Fig. 1 in Osamu. Osamu does not disclose or suggest an active matrix circuit having plural pixels in which an electroluminescence element is to be driven by a transistor.

Accordingly, Claims 1-4, 13 and 14 are not disclosed or suggested by Osamu and are patentable thereover. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6-8 and 11

The Examiner also rejects Claims 6-8 and 11 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over Osamu et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending dependent Claims 6-8 and 11 to recite that the claims are directed to an active matrix electroluminescence display device.

As explained above, Osamu does not disclose or suggest an active matrix circuit having plural pixels as recited in the independent claim and these dependent claims. As each of these claims is a dependent claim, each is not disclosed or suggested by Osamu for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims and is patentable over Osamu. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9, 12, 15-31

The Examiner also rejects Claims 9, 12, 15-31 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Osamu et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending the claims to recite that the claims are directed to an active matrix electroluminescence display device having plural pixels.

As explained above, Osamu does not disclose or suggest an active matrix circuit having plural pixels. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, these claims are also not disclosed or suggested by Osamu and are patentable over Osamu. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicant is also adding new dependent Claims 32-40 which recite “wherein each of the pixels further comprises a thin film transistor connected to the first electrode [anode or cathode].” These features are also supported by, for example, Embodiment 1 of the present application and are clearly shown in Fig. 6B.

Accordingly, as an RCE is being submitted herewith, it is respectfully requested that these new claims be entered and considered at this time. If any fee should be due for these new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment, extension of time or RCE, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 26, 2006

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 000026568